

REMARKS

Applicant hereby submits this Response to the Election/Restriction notice dated July 9, 2009, within one month, given August 9, 2009 was a Sunday.

Claims 1-24 have been examined.

For at least the fifth time the Examiner has restricted claims 1-24.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for meeting with the undersigned for an in-person Examiner Interview on Tuesday August 4, 2009. It was a pleasure to finally meet you Examiner Nguyen. A copy of the Examiner Interview Summary related to the August 4, 2009 Examiner Interview is attached hereto. Applicant thanks the Examiner for agreeing to withdraw the restriction and to examine all of the claims, claims 1-24, together, as noted in the Examiner Interview Summary. During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner and the undersigned discussed the Election/Restriction requirement and agreed that the claims of Group 2, claims 14, 15, 19, and 20 were sufficiently close to claims 4 and 7-10 of the Group I claims, so that the restriction/election would not be maintained. Further, the Examiner expressed concerns that all of claims 1-24 were not sufficiently close to the subject matter that he typically examines, but agreed to examine all of claims 1-24. Finally, discussed that the more narrow claims such as claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 were likely patentable.

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for agreeing to the in-person Examiner Interview and the opportunity to finally meeting you in person, for you reasonably agreeing to withdrawing all of the pending Election/Restriction requirements, and for noting that you believes that some of the claims contain patentable subject matter. I and the Applicant looks forward to the

Examiner's next Office Action in this case and hope to come to agreement shortly on the allowable subject matter in this case.

In any case, as required by the rules, Applicant hereby provisionally elects one of the groups, Group I having claims 1-13, 16-18, and 21-24, for Examination. However, Applicant submits that Group II must be examined with Group I, and there is no additional burden on the Examiner for doing so, and that this matter is now moot given the Examiner's agreement during the August 4, 2009 Examiner Interview that he would remove the Election/Restriction requirement and all of claims 1-24 will be examined together. Finally, Applicant hopes that the Examiner will seriously consider including Claims 19 and 20 in the substantive examination because Applicant believe that the previous amendments to these claims resulted in all claims are directed to the same invention, and they should all be examined together.

If for any reason the Examiner believes that the present application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below or on my mobile telephone at 703-731-7220.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin Alan Wolff
Registration No. 42,233

Wolff Law Offices, PLLC
P.O. Box 9855
Chapel Hill, NC 27515-9855
Telephone: 919-933-9684
FAX: 919-933-9684

Date: August 10, 2009